

Phase I Muddy River Flood Control, Water Quality and Environmental Enhancement", and to report its findings to Congress by December 31, 1999. The Plan was commissioned by the Boston Parks and Recreation Department and issued in January 1999. It presents a solution that has broad community support. Residents and businesses joined with the Town of Brookline, City of Boston, State of Massachusetts and the federal government to develop this plan. It draws on research by the Army Corps of Engineers, the Federal Emergency Management Agency and others to recommend comprehensive improvements to end destructive flooding, enhance water quality and protect habitat. I believe this project embodies the kind of citizen-government partnership that is necessary for an efficient and successful use of federal resources.

The Massachusetts delegation, the Town of Brookline, the City of Boston and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts all look forward to working with the Army Corps in Boston and Washington over the coming months to complete this evaluation by the end of the year, and to move ahead with the work of ending these destructive floods and making other needed improvements.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I am pleased that the Water Resources Development Act of 1999, passed by the Senate yesterday, incorporates so many projects of importance to the Great Lakes region. I am especially pleased that so many of these projects serve to reinforce the pre-eminent leadership of the Chicago regional office in meeting the environmental responsibilities assigned to the Army Corps of Engineers in past reauthorizations of the Water Resources Development Act.

Mr. President, the Water Resources Development Act of 1999 incorporates a very important matter which I have considered a priority for some time. The subject is contaminated sediments and they are a potential threat to public and environmental health across the country. Persistent, bioaccumulative toxic substances in contaminated sediment can poison the food chain, making fish and shellfish unsafe for humans and wildlife to eat. Contamination of sediments can also interfere with recreational uses and increase the costs of and time needed for navigational dredging and subsequent disposal of dredged material.

Unfortunately, the resources of the federal government have not been brought to bear on these problems in a well coordinated fashion. Section 222 of this Act will require the Environmental Protection Agency and Army Corps of Engineers to finally activate the National Contaminated Sediment Task Force that was mandated by the Water Resources Development Act of 1992. I am hopeful that convening this Task Force will encourage the Federal agencies to work together to combat this problem and create greater public awareness of the need to address con-

taminated sediments. We also need a better understanding of the quantities and sources of sediment contamination, to prevent recontamination and minimize the recurrence of these costs and impacts, and to get a handle on the extent of the public health threat. To that end, the Act requires the Task Force to report on the status of remedial action on contaminated sediments around the country, including a description of the authorities used in cleanup, the nature and sources of sediment contamination, the methods for determining the need for cleanup, the fate of dredged materials and barriers to swift remediation.

Mr. President, as the Democratic Co-Chair of the Senate Great Lakes Task Force, I would like to take this opportunity to highlight several specific programs included in this bill which were developed through the bipartisan and bicameral cooperation of the members of this Task Force. Extension of cost-sharing rules to allow non-traditional partners such as non-profit organizations to partner with the Army Corps of Engineers on restoration activities will greatly expand the potential uses of these authorities in the Great Lakes basin (Sections 205 and 206). Section 224(2) will enhance the authority of the Corps to work cooperatively with the Great Lakes Fishery Commission to make more efficient use of Corps' engineering expertise in constructing barriers and traps to reduce these aggressive invaders. Section 225 authorizes a special study on the watershed of the western basin of Lake Erie to enhance the integration of disparate elements of the Corps' program in this region. Section 223, the Great Lakes Basin Program incorporates three high-profile elements critical to the region as a whole which were developed through extensive negotiations among Task Force members at the end of the 105th Congress.

The first element of the Great Lakes Basin Program (Section 223a) directs the Army Corps of Engineers to develop a framework for their activities in the Great Lakes basin to be updated biennially. Many Army Corps of Engineers divisions have developed and use such strategic plans. Among other strengths, such plans allow greater programmatic coordination—especially among projects conducted for such disparate purposes as navigation, environmental restoration, water quality, and flood control. Development of such a strategic plan for the Great Lakes basin has never been more important than at present, given the recent restructuring of the Army Corps of Engineers which leaves the Great Lakes and Ohio River division as the only Army Corps of Engineers division maintaining two regional offices (Chicago and Cincinnati).

The second element of the Great Lakes Basin Program (Section 223b) directs the Army Corps of Engineers to inventory existing information relevant to the Great Lakes

biohydrological system and sustainable water use management. The Corps is to report to Congress, as well as to the International Joint Commission and the eight Great Lakes states, on the results of this inventory and recommendations on how to improve the information base. This information is crucial to the ongoing debate regarding attempts to export or divert Great Lakes surface and ground water out of the basin. The closely related provision, contained in subsection (e), on water use activities and policies, allows the Secretary to provide technical assistance to the Great Lakes states in development of interstate guidelines to improve consistency and efficiency of State-level water use activities and policies.

The third major element of the Great Lakes Basin Program (Section 223c) directs the Army Corps of Engineers to submit to Congress a report based on existing information detailing the economic benefits of recreational boating in the Great Lakes basin. As many of my colleagues may know, despite Congress' repeated objections, consecutive Administrations have unwisely sought to limit the Corps' role in dredging recreational harbors. Clearly these harbors' value to the regional economy should be recognized in the cost-benefit analyses used in making dredging decisions. For the Great Lakes region, dredging of these recreational harbors will be of increasing importance in the coming year as Great Lakes water levels decline from the high of the past several years.

Mr. President, I also wish to take a moment in closing to highlight the several specific projects included in the recently passed bill which will benefit my home state of Michigan. They include an Army Corps feasibility study of improvements to the Detroit River waterfront as part of the ongoing revitalization of the area. The Corps will prepare studies for flood control projects in St. Clair Shores and along the Saginaw River in Bay City. The Corps will consider reconstruction of the Hamilton Dam flood control project and review its denial of the city of Charlevoix's request for reimbursement of construction costs incurred in building a new revetment connection to the Federal navigation project at Charlevoix Harbor. Finally, the bill includes a unique provision which will allow the use of materials dredged from Toledo Harbor in Ohio for environmental restoration on the Woodtick Peninsula in Michigan.

Mr. President, I appreciate the hard work of my colleagues on the Environment and Public Works Committee in incorporating these important provisions into this bill and look forward to working with them to get these important provisions signed into law.

THE LESSONS OF BABY HOPE

Mr. DEWINE. Mr. President, one of the key virtues of living in a free society such as our own is that it's harder

for injustice to remain hidden and unreported. Unlike Communist and fascist countries—countries where the government can control access to information, and cover up genocide and war crimes for years—in our country, people are allowed to stand up and tell the truth. They can reveal inconvenient and unpleasant facts about moral evils that are taking place in our society.

To speak the truth—to distinguish right from wrong, you don't have to be a President, or a Senator, or a famous human rights crusader like Martin Luther King, Jr. You can be anybody. You can be a medical technician in Cincinnati, OH.

Mr. President, let me tell you a story about how—very recently, in my home State of Ohio—some disturbing truths were revealed that many Americans simply wish would go away.

On April 6, a young woman went into an abortion clinic in Montgomery County, OH, to undergo a procedure known as partial-birth abortion. This is a procedure that usually takes place behind closed doors, where it can be ignored, its moral status left unquestioned.

But this particular procedure was different. In this procedure, on April 6, things did not go as planned. Here's what happened.

The Dayton, OH, abortionist, Dr. Martin Haskell, started a procedure to dilate her cervix, so the child could eventually be removed and killed. He applied seaweed to start the procedure. He then sent her home—because this procedure usually takes 2 or 3 days. In fact, the patient is supposed to return on the second day for a further application of seaweed—and then come back a third time for the actual partial-birth abortion—a 3-day procedure.

So the woman went home to Cincinnati, expecting to return to Dayton and complete the procedure in 2 or 3 days. But her cervix dilated far too quickly. Shortly after midnight on the first day, after experiencing severe stomach pains, she was admitted to Bethesda North Hospital in Cincinnati.

The child was born. After 3 hours and 8 minutes, this little girl died.

The cause of death was listed on the death certificate as "prematurity secondary to induced abortion."

True enough, Mr. President. But also on the death certificate is a space for "Method of death." And it says, in the case of this child, "Method of death: natural."

I do not mean to quarrel, talk about whether this is true in the technical sense. But if you look at the events that led up to her death, you'll see that there was really nothing natural about them at all.

The medical technician who held that little girl for the 3 hours and 8 minutes of her short life named her Baby Hope. Baby Hope did not die of natural causes. She was the victim of a barbaric procedure that is opposed by the vast majority of the American people.

A procedure that has twice been banned by act of Congress—only to see the ban repeatedly overturned by a Presidential veto.

The death of Baby Hope did not take place behind the closed doors of an abortion clinic. It took place in public—in a hospital dedicated to saving lives, not taking them. Her death reminds us of the brutal reality and tragedy of what partial-birth abortion really is.

When we voted to ban partial-birth abortions, we talked about this procedure in graphic detail. The public reaction to this disclosure—the disclosure of what partial-birth abortion really is—was loud and it was decisive. And there is a very good reason for this. The procedure is barbaric.

One of the first questions people ask is "why?"

"Why do they do this procedure? Is it really necessary? Why do we allow this to happen?"

Dr. C. Everett Koop speaks for the consensus of the medical profession when he says this is never a medically necessary procedure. Even Martin Haskell—the abortionist in the Baby Hope case—has admitted that at least 80 percent of the partial-birth abortions he performs are elective.

The facts are clear. Partial-birth abortion is not that rare a procedure. What is rare is that we—as a society—saw it happen. It happened by surprise at a regular hospital where it wasn't supposed to happen.

Baby Hope was not supposed to die in the arms of a medical technician. But she did. And this little baby cannot be easily ignored. We cannot turn our back on this reality.

This procedure is not limited to mothers and fetuses who are in danger. It is performed on healthy women—and healthy babies—all the time.

The goal of a partial-birth abortion is not to protect somebody's health but to kill a child. That is what the abortionist wants to do.

Dr. Haskell himself has said as much. In an interview with the American Medical News, he said:

You could dilate further and deliver the baby alive but that's really not the point.

The point is, you are attempting to do an abortion, and that is the goal of your work, is to complete an abortion, not to see how do I manipulate the situation so I get a live birth instead.

Now Dr. Haskell has admitted what the reality is. Why don't we?

Again, let's hear Dr. Haskell in his own words, a man who performed this abortion on Baby Hope. This is what Dr. Haskell says about this "procedure."

These are Dr. Haskell's words:

I just kept on doing the D&E's [dilation and extraction] because that is what I was comfortable with, up until 24 weeks. But they were very tough. Sometimes it was a 45-minute operation. I noticed some of the later D&Es were very, very easy. So I asked myself why can't they all happen this way. You see the easy ones would have a foot length presentation, you'd reach up and grab the

foot of the fetus, pull the fetus down and the head would hang up and then you would collapse the head and take it out. It was easy.

It was easy, Mr. President. Easy for Dr. Haskell. He does not say it was easy for the mother, and he certainly does not say it was easy for the baby. I suspect he doesn't care. His goal is to perform abortions. But is he the person we are going to trust to decide when abortions are necessary? Dr. Haskell has a production line going in Dayton, OH. Nothing is going to stop him from meeting his quota.

Dr. Haskell continues. Again, the words of Dr. Haskell:

At first, I would reach around trying to identify a lower extremity blindly with the tip of my instrument. I'd get it right about 30-50 percent of the time. Then I said, "Well, gee, if I just put the ultrasound up there, I could see it all and I wouldn't have to feel around for it." I did that and sure enough, I found it 99 percent of the time. Kind of serendipity.

Serendipity, Mr. President.

Let me conclude. We need to ask ourselves, what does our toleration in this country of this "procedure" say about us as a nation? Where do we draw the line? At what point do we finally stop saying, "Well, I don't really like this, but it doesn't really matter to me, so I will put up with it"? When do we stop saying that as a country, Mr. President? At what point do we say, "Unless we stop this from happening, we cannot justly call ourselves a civilized Nation"?

When you come right down to it, America's moral anesthetic is wearing off. It really is. We know what is going on behind the curtain, and we cannot wish that knowledge away. We have to face it, and we have to do what is right.

This week, some of my colleagues and I will be reintroducing the Partial-Birth Abortion Ban Act. Twice in the last 3 years, Congress has passed this legislation with strong bipartisan support, only to see it fall victim to a Presidential veto. Once again, I am confident Congress will do the right thing and pass this very important legislation. But that is not enough. Passing this legislation in Congress is not enough. For lives to be saved, the bill must actually become law.

Mr. President, if something happens behind the iron curtain of an abortion clinic, it is easier to pretend it simply did not happen. But the death of Baby Hope in Cincinnati, OH, in the last few days has torn that curtain, revealing the truth of this barbaric procedure.

Let people not ask about us 50 years from now: How could they not have known? or ask: Why didn't they do anything? because, Mr. President, the fact is, we do know and we must take action.

I yield the floor.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Williams, one of his secretaries.